



IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Andrew M. SPENCER et al.

Confirmation No.: 4492

Application No.: 09/996,720

Examiner: C. Chace

Filing Date: 11/30/2001

Group Art Unit: 2187

Title: METHOD TO STORE AND RETRIEVE MEMORY CARD USAGE INFORMATION

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on 09/24/2004.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$340.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

() (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:

() one month	\$110.00
() two months	\$430.00
() three months	\$980.00
() four months	\$1530.00

() The extension fee has already been filled in this application.

(X) (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of \$340.00. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

() I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. Date of Deposit: _____

OR

() I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number _____ on _____

Number of pages:

Typed Name:

Signature: _____

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew M. SPENCER et al.

By Therese D. Leeb *Log. No. 43,438*

1/for William T. Ellis

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 26,874

Date: 11/18/2004

Telephone No.: 202-672-5485



Atty. Dkt. No. 10014185-1

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Applicant: Andrew M. Spencer, et al.

Title: METHOD TO STORE AND RETRIEVE MEMORY CARD USAGE
INFORMATION

Appl. No.: 09/996,720

Filing Date: 11/30/2004

Examiner: C. CHACE

Art Unit: 2187

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 41.37, this Appeal Brief is being filed together with a check in the amount of \$340.00 covering the Rule 41.20(b)(2) appeal fee. If this fee is deemed to be insufficient, authorization is hereby given to charge any deficiency (or credit any balance) to the undersigned deposit account 19-0741.

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is the assignee of record, Hewlett Packard Company.

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

3. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-18 and 20-33 are pending in the application. Claim 19 is cancelled. Claims

1-18 and 20-33 are rejected and are the subject of this appeal.

11/19/2004 EABUBAK1 00000030 082025 09996720

01 FC:1402 340.00 DA

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The present application is under a final rejection (See Final Rejection mailed May 25, 2004). Appeal of claims 1-18 and 20-33 is appropriate because all of the claims have been twice rejected. See 35 U.S.C. § 134(a). There are no amendments after final rejection.

5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A summary of the claimed subject matter is provided below with reference numerals and references to the specification and drawings. The summary is set forth in nine exemplary embodiments that correspond to independent claims 1, 14, 16, 17, 23, 28, 29, 30, and 32. Discussions about elements and recitations of these claims can be found at least at the cited locations in the specification and drawings.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for storing memory card usage information on a memory card. The method comprises collecting information about usage of the memory card (See step 10 of Fig. 1, p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 7-9). The specification provides a number of examples of usage of a memory card, such as power-on events, write events, and read events (See p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 2-7). The specification also distinguishes memory card usage information from other information such as customerID or resellerID information (See p. 8, paragraph [0032]). The information about usage of the memory card is recorded in an area of the memory card (See step 20 of Fig. 1, pp. 6-7, paragraph [0026]). The information about usage of the memory card is accessed from the memory card (See step 30 of Fig. 1, p. 1, paragraph [0003], pp. 7-8, paragraph [0029]).

Independent claim 14 is directed to a data structure in a memory card. The data structure comprises a computer readable storage containing at least one event descriptor about the usage of the memory card (See p. 3, paragraph [0016]). For each event descriptor there is a count representing the number of occurrences of that event (See p. 3, paragraph [0016]).

Independent claim 16 is directed to a system for storing memory card usage information on a memory card. The memory card comprises a number of components

including: (1) a component for collecting information about usage of the memory card (See step 10 of Fig. 1, p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 7-9, p. 3, paragraph [0018]), (2) a component for recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card (See step 20 of Fig. 1, pp. 6-7, paragraph [0026], p. 3, paragraph [0018]), and (3) a component for accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card (See step 30 of Fig. 1, p. 1, paragraph [0003], pp. 7-8, paragraph [0029], p. 3, paragraph [0018]).

Independent claim 17 is directed to a method. The method comprises collecting information about usage of a portable memory card in an electronic device (See step 10 of Fig. 1, p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 7-9), and recording the information about usage of the memory card on the memory card itself (See step 20 of Fig. 1, pp. 6-7, paragraph [0026]).

Independent claim 23 is directed to a method. The method comprises a number of steps including (1) providing a portable memory card, (2) monitoring usage of the memory card (See step 10 of Fig. 1, p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 4-8), (3) storing the usage of the memory card on the memory card (See step 20 of Fig. 1, pp. 6-7, paragraph [0026]), and (4) displaying the usage of the memory card on the memory card (See pp. 7-8, paragraph [0029]).

Independent claim 28 is directed to a method for storing memory card usage information on a memory card, comprising a number of steps including (1) collecting information about usage of the memory card (See step 10 of Fig. 1, p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 7-9), (2) recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card (See step 20 of Fig. 1, pp. 6-7, paragraph [0026]), (3) accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card (See step 30 of Fig. 1, p. 1, paragraph [0003], pp. 7-8, paragraph [0029]), and (4) displaying the information about the usage of the memory card on a screen on the memory card (See pp. 7-8, paragraph [0029]).

Independent claim 29 is directed to a system for storing memory card usage information on a memory card, comprising a number of components including (1) a component for collecting information about usage of the memory card (See step 10 of Fig. 1,

p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 7-9, p. 3, paragraph [0018]), (2) a component for recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card (See step 20 of Fig. 1, pp. 6-7, paragraph [0026], p. 3, paragraph [0018]), (3) a component for accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card (See step 30 of Fig. 1, p. 1, paragraph [0003], pp. 7-8, paragraph [0029], p. 3, paragraph [0018]), and (4) a screen for displaying the information about the usage of the memory card (See p. 8, paragraph [0030]).

Independent claim 30 is directed to a method for storing memory card usage information on a memory card comprising a number of steps including (1) collecting information about usage of the memory card (See step 10 of Fig. 1, p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 7-9), (2) recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card (See step 20 of Fig. 1, pp. 6-7, paragraph [0026]), and (3) accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card (See step 30 of Fig. 1, p. 1, paragraph [0003], pp. 7-8, paragraph [0029]), wherein the information about usage of the memory card comprises at least one of a measurement of how full the memory card is and the number of times data was corrected by the memory card (See p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 22-25).

Independent claim 32 is directed to a system for storing memory card usage information on a memory card comprising a number of components including (1) a component for collecting information about usage of the memory card (See step 10 of Fig. 1, p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 7-9, p. 3, paragraph [0018]), (2) a component for recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card (See step 20 of Fig. 1, pp. 6-7, paragraph [0026], p. 3, paragraph [0018]), and (3) a component for accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card (See step 30 of Fig. 1, p. 1, paragraph [0003], pp. 7-8, paragraph [0029], p. 3, paragraph [0018]), wherein the information about usage of the memory card comprises at least one of a measurement of how full the memory card is and the number of times data was corrected by the memory card (See p. 4, paragraph [0021], lines 22-25).

6. **GROUND S OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal are:

A. the rejection of claims 1-17 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0107832 to Shimizu et al. (hereafter “Shimizu”);

B. the rejection of claims 23-26 and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,478,679 to Himoto et al. (hereafter “Himoto”);

C. the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,532,689 to Bueno (hereafter “Bueno”); and

D. the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,140 to No (hereafter “No”).

7. **ARGUMENT**

A. The rejection of claims 1-17 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimizu

1. Claims 1, 3-12, 14-17, and 22 of which claims 1, 14, 16 and 17 are independent

Shimizu does not disclose information about usage of a memory card in the manner recited in the claims.

Independent claims 1, 14, 16 and 17 all require steps or components for performing steps regarding information or event descriptors about usage of a memory card. For example, independent claim 1 recites “recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card.” With respect to this feature, the Final Rejection on page 3, last

paragraph states: “Recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card is disclosed in paragraph 61 [of Shimizu] as the generated use condition information and the billing information being recorded in the control information storage unit 726.” Appellants submit, however, that Shimizu fails to suggest the recording step as recited in claim 1, either in paragraph 61 or in any other portion of Shimizu.

Shimizu discloses in paragraph 61 recording generated use condition information and billing information in a control information storage unit 726 of a website, where the use condition information includes period of rent, number of times reproduction is possible, and whether or not copying is allowed.

Shimizu, however, fails to disclose recording information about the usage of a memory card in paragraph 61, or anywhere else in Shimizu. Appellants submit that the number of times a website has been accessed cannot reasonably be interpreted as the usage of a memory card, whether or not the number of times is stored on the memory card. Since it represents usage of the web site and is unrelated to any usage of the memory card. Moreover, the generated use condition information and billing information disclosed in paragraph 61 is directed to rental of a DVD (See Shimizu, paragraph 61), and also cannot be reasonably interpreted as usage of a memory card. For example, the number of times the reproduction is possible concerns reproduction of a DVD, not the usage of a memory card.

The Examiner’s interpretation of information about usage of a memory card is not reasonable.

Appellants maintain (and have maintained throughout the prosecution of the present application) that the Examiner’s interpretation of information about usage of a memory card (or event descriptors about usage of a memory card) in the claims is not a reasonable interpretation of the claims. Claims under examination are to be given a broad reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (emphasis added). The claim interpretation must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. In re Cortright, 15 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The interpretation by the

Examiner is neither consistent with the plain language of the claims, the specification or the file history of the present application or the interpretation of those skilled in the art. If the claims are reasonably interpreted, the rejections based on Shimizu must fail.

The interpretation of the limitation of “information about usage of the memory card” to include a record of information concerning the use of rented DVDs, or the number of times a website has been accessed as disclosed in Shimizu is not a reasonable interpretation of that limitation. This interpretation is neither consistent with the plain language of claim 1, the specification, or the file history of the present application.

In Shimizu, information concerning the use of rented DVDs is just that, information about the use of DVDs. This information is not about the usage or any other aspect of a memory card, even if that information about the use of DVDs happens to be stored on a memory card. The mere fact that general information is stored on a memory card does not make it information about the use of the memory card. This interpretation by the Examiner would essentially require that any information that is stored on a memory card be information about the use of the memory card merely because a memory card may act to store the information.

The specification specifically distinguishes between information about the usage of a memory card, and other information that is merely stored on the memory card. For example, page 8, paragraph 32 of the specification discloses associating customerID or resellerID information fields with usage information. Thus, usage information is distinguished from customerID or resellerID information in the specification even though both types of information may be stored on a memory card.

Further, during prosecution of the present application, appellants have repeatedly distinguished general information, such as a record of information concerning the use of DVDs or the number of times a website has been accessed as disclosed in Shimizu, from information about the usage of a memory card. Thus, the file history of the present application also makes clear that the phrase “information about the usage of a memory card”

does not include general information merely because that information happens to be stored on a memory card.

In sum, the plain meaning of “information about the usage of a memory card”, the specification, and the file history all make clear that general information is not information about the usage of a memory card merely because that information happens to be stored on a memory card. Thus, the interpretation of the limitation of “information about usage of the memory card” to include a record of information concerning the use of rented DVDs, or the number of times a website has been accessed as disclosed in Shimizu is not a reasonable interpretation of that limitation.

In the Response to Arguments section on page 15 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner cites to paragraphs 59 and 61 of Shimizu as disclosing information about usage of the memory card. Appellants respectfully disagree. While paragraphs 59 and 61 disclose “use conditions” and “use condition information”, this use condition information does not refer to the use of a memory card. Instead the use condition information refers to use of rented DVDs, and includes period of rent, number of times reproduction is possible, and whether or not copying is allowed (See Shimizu, paragraph [0061]).

Independent claims 14, 16 and 17

Independent claim 14 is directed to a data structure in a memory card. The data structure comprises computer readable storage containing at least one event descriptor about the usage of the memory card, and for each event descriptor a count representing the number of occurrences of that event. Shimizu fails to disclose a computer readable storage containing at least one event descriptor about the usage of the memory card. Thus, claim 14 is likewise patentable over Shimizu.

Independent claim 16 is directed to a system for storing memory card usage information on a memory card, comprising a component for collecting information about usage of the memory card, and a component for recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card. Shimizu fails to disclose or suggest collecting

information about the usage of a memory card, and storing that information in an area of the memory card. Thus, claim 16 is likewise patentable over Shimizu.

Independent claim 17 is directed to a method. The method comprises collecting information about usage of a portable memory card in an electronic device, and recording the information about usage of the memory card on the memory card itself. Shimizu fails to disclose collecting information about usage of a portable memory card in an electronic device, and recording the information about the usage on the memory card itself. Thus, claim 17 is likewise patentable over Shimizu.

Dependent claims 3-12, 15, 18 and 22 depend from one of independent claims 1, 14 and 17, and are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

2. Claim 2

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and thus the arguments with respect to claim 1 apply equally well to claim 2. Claim 2 is further patentable for at least the following reasons.

Claim 2 recites “wherein the collecting step comprises monitoring write events, read events and power-on events.” This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Shimizu. The Office Action on page 4 cites to Figure 6 of Shimizu as disclosing the features of claim 2, and argues that the “monitoring” is inherently performed when write events, read events and power-on events are being performed stating: “By performing the transaction, the system must, inherently, be aware of it.” Monitoring a write, read or power-on event, however, requires more from a system than merely performing those steps, and Shimizu fails to disclose such monitoring.

3. Claim 13

Claim 13 depends from claim 1, and thus the arguments with respect to claim 1 apply equally well to claim 13. Claim 13 is further patentable for at least the following reasons.

Claim 13 recites “wherein the collecting step comprises changing a count associated with an event descriptor when the event occurs; and further comprising the steps of comparing the count to a threshold, and if the threshold is equaled or exceeded, then causing a message to be sent.” This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Shimizu. The Final Office Action on page 7 cites to paragraph 10 of Shimizu as disclosing this feature. The cited section of Shimizu, however, does not disclose any comparison of a count associated with an event descriptor to a threshold, such that if the threshold is equaled or exceeded, a message is sent. There is simply no comparison of an event descriptor count to a threshold disclosed in paragraph 10 of Shimizu.

4. Claim 20

Claim 20 depends from claim 17, and thus the arguments with respect to claim 17 apply equally well to claim 20. Claim 20 is further patentable for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20 recites “wherein collecting information further comprises counting a number of times an image file was written to the memory card.” This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Shimizu. The Final Office Action on page 8 cites to paragraph 2 and Figure 4 of Shimizu as disclosing this feature. While paragraph 2 refers to image data, neither paragraph 2 nor the information in Figure 4 suggest that the number of times that image data is written to a memory card is counted.

5. Claim 21

Claim 21 depends from claim 17, and thus the arguments with respect to claim 17 apply equally well to claim 21. Claim 21 is further patentable for at least the following reasons.

Claim 21 recites “wherein collecting information further comprises counting a number of times music files were written to the memory card.” This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Shimizu. The Final Office Action on page 9 cites to paragraph 2 and Figure 4 of Shimizu as disclosing this feature. While paragraph 2 refers to audio data, neither

paragraph 2 nor the information in Figure 4 suggest that the number of times that audio data is written to a memory card is counted.

B. The rejection of claims 23-26 and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Himoto

1. Claims 23-26 and 28-29 of which claims 23 and 28-29 are independent

Independent claims 23 and 28-29 all require steps or components for performing steps regarding information about usage of a memory card. For example, independent claim 23 recites “monitoring usage of the memory card”, and “storing the usage of the memory card” on the memory card. With respect to the limitation “usage of the memory card”, the Examiner states on page 10 of the Final Office Action: “[the] examiner has interpreted ‘usage of the memory card’ as the type of games stored and the respective scores, for example, as shown in figure 7, 8A, and 8B [of Himoto], as they are activities stored on the card that are not used by the card.” Appellants respectfully disagree with this interpretation.

Himoto discloses a memory card 10 with an LCD 14 that displays information such as game number and game scores (see Figures 7-8B). Himoto, however, does not disclose monitoring usage of the memory card, and storing the usage of the memory card on the memory card. The information displayed on the LCD 14 of Himoto, whether stored in the memory card 10 or not, cannot reasonably be interpreted as usage of the memory card for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to Shimizu.

In Himoto, information such as game number and game score is merely information about a game. This information is not about the usage of a memory card, even if that information concerning the game number and game score happens to be stored on a memory card. As discussed above with respect to Shimizu, the mere fact that general information is stored on a memory card does not make it information about the use of the memory card.

Moreover, the arguments with respect to the reasonableness of the Examiner's interpretation of the "usage of the memory card" apply equally well to the rejection based on Himoto.

In sum, Himoto fails to disclose or suggest features recited in claim 23, and claim 23 is patentable thereover for at least this reason.

Dependent claims 24-26 depend from claim 23, and are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as for patentable features recited therein.

Independent claims 28 and 29 recite, respectively, "recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card" and "a component for recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card." For the reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 23, Himoto does not suggest recording information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card.

2. Claims 30-33, of which claims 30 and 32 are independent

Independent claims 30 and 32 recite, respectively, "recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card" and "a component for recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card" in a similar fashion to claims 28 and 29, and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to those claims. Moreover, claims 30 and 32 require that the information about usage of the memory card comprises at least one of a measurement of how full the memory card is and the number of times data was corrected by the memory card. This feature is also not disclosed by Himoto. The Final Office Action on page 12 alleges that Figures 5A-5E, 6A-6C and col. 10, lines 64-67 of Himoto disclose this feature. Appellants respectfully disagree. Figures 5A-5E and 6A-6C merely illustrate the address region in which a program is stored. Himoto, however, does not disclose that a measurement of how full the memory is is recorded in a memory card. Appellants submit that a stored program is not a measurement of how full a memory card

merely because that program is stored in a memory between certain addresses of the memory card.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action on p. 15, the Examiner also states with respect to the Himoto figures 5A-E and 6A-C and the limitation of a measurement of how full a memory card is (in claims 30 and 32) that the “examiner has interpreted the display of the figures to be a qualitative measurement, as the user can see about how much of the memory is full.” Appellants submit that Figures 5A-5E and 6A-6C of Himoto fail to disclose recording information about usage of a memory card where the information about usage of a memory card comprises a measurement of how full a memory card. Figures 5A-E and 6A-C of Himoto do not disclose this feature, either qualitatively or quantitatively.

Claims 31 and 33 depend from claims 30 and 32, respectively, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as well as for further patentable features recite therein.

C. The rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Bueno

Claim 18

Claim 18 depends from claim 17. As discussed above, Shimizu, does not disclose or suggest as recited in claim 17, collecting information about usage of a portable memory card in an electronic device, and recording the information about the usage on the memory card itself. Bueno was cited for allegedly disclosing counting the number of times a memory card is inserted into an electronic device, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Shimizu. Thus, claim 18 is patentable over Shimizu and Bueno.

D. The rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himoto in view of No

Claim 27

Claim 27 depends from claim 23. As discussed above, Himoto, does not disclose or suggest as recited in claim 23, monitoring usage of the memory card, and storing the usage of the memory card on the memory card. No fails to cure the deficiencies of Himoto. No was cited for allegedly disclosing a memory card for use in a digital camera. No, however, also fails to disclose or suggest monitoring usage of the memory card, and storing the usage of the memory card on the memory card.

8. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the PTO's rejections are erroneous, and reversal of the applied rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 18, 2004

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Previously Presented) A method for storing memory card usage information on a memory card, comprising the steps of:

collecting information about usage of the memory card;
recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card; and
accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card.

2. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the collecting step comprises monitoring write events, read events and power-on events.

3. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the collecting step comprises changing a count associated with an event descriptor when the event occurs.

4. (Previously Presented) The method as defined in claim 3, wherein the collecting step further comprises storing a value parameter associated with said event descriptor when the event occurs.

5. (Previously Presented) The method as defined in claim 3, wherein the collecting step comprises changing a running total associated with said event descriptor when the event occurs.

6. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the recording step comprises recording the information about usage in a dedicated area in said memory card.

7. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the recording step comprises recording the information about usage in a non-user accessible area of memory.

8. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the collecting step comprises changing a count associated with an event description when the event occurs; and wherein the accessing step comprises displaying the count.

9. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein there are a plurality of event descriptors; and wherein said accessing step comprises displaying a plurality of the event

descriptors, wherein each of the displayed plurality of events descriptors is selectable, so that on selection, additional usage information will be displayed that is associated with that selected event descriptor.

10. (Original) The method as defined in claim 8, wherein the displaying step is performed at a host.

11 (Previously Presented) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the accessing step comprises displaying real-time information about usage in a window on a screen at a host.

12. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1, further comprising the step of creating write and read commands allowing the host to store the information about usage and read that information.

13. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the collecting step comprises changing a count associated with an event descriptor when the event occurs; and further comprising the steps of comparing the count to a threshold, and if the threshold is equaled or exceeded, then causing a message to be sent.

14. (Previously Presented) A data structure in a memory card, comprising, computer readable storage containing at least one event descriptor about the usage of the memory card, and for each event descriptor a count representing the number of occurrences of that event.

15. (Previously Presented) A data structure as defined in claim 14, further comprising for each of a plurality of event descriptors an amount of memory used by an aggregation of events corresponding to respective each of the event descriptors.

16. (Previously Presented) A system for storing memory card usage information on a memory card, comprising:

- a component for collecting information about usage of the memory card;
- a component for recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card; and

a component for accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card.

17. (Previously Presented) A method, comprising:
collecting information about usage of a portable memory card in an electronic device;
and
recording the information about usage of the memory card on the memory card itself.

18. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 17 wherein collecting information further comprises counting physical insertions of the memory card into the electronic device.

19. (Cancelled)

20. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 17 wherein collecting information further comprises counting a number of times an image file was written to the memory card.

21. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 17 wherein collecting information further comprises counting a number of times music files were written to the memory card.

22. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 17 wherein collecting information further comprises tracking a number of times the memory card is formatted.

23. (Previously Presented) A method, comprising:
providing a portable memory card;
monitoring usage of the memory card;
storing the usage of the memory card on the memory card; and
displaying the usage of the memory card on the memory card.

24. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 23 wherein displaying the usage further comprises displaying the usage on a window on the memory card.

25. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 23 wherein displaying the usage further comprises displaying the usage on a screen on the memory card.

26. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 23 wherein monitoring usage comprises monitoring an amount of memory used on the memory card and monitoring an amount of memory remaining free on the memory card.

27. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 23 wherein providing a portable memory card further comprises providing the portable memory card in a digital camera.

28. (Previously Presented) A method for storing memory card usage information on a memory card, comprising the steps of:

- collecting information about usage of the memory card;
- recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card;
- accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card;
- and
- displaying the information about the usage of the memory card on a screen on the memory card.

29. (Previously Presented) A system for storing memory card usage information on a memory card, comprising:

- a component for collecting information about usage of the memory card;
- a component for recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card;
- a component for accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card; and
- a screen for displaying the information about the usage of the memory card.

30. (Previously Presented) A method for storing memory card usage information on a memory card, comprising the steps of:

- collecting information about usage of the memory card;
- recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card; and

accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card, wherein the information about usage of the memory card comprises at least one of a measurement of how full the memory card is and the number of times data was corrected by the memory card.

31. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 30, wherein the information about usage of the memory card comprises a measurement of how full the memory card is.

32. (Previously Presented) A system for storing memory card usage information on a memory card, comprising:

- a component for collecting information about usage of the memory card;
- a component for recording the information about usage of the memory card in an area of the memory card; and
- a component for accessing the information about usage of the memory card from the memory card, wherein the information about usage of the memory card comprises at least one of a measurement of how full the memory card is and the number of times data was corrected by the memory card.

33. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 32, wherein the information about usage of the memory card comprises a measurement of how full the memory card is.